

claim No. 106, which, though proved, is likewise exposed to the operation of the same plea.

There is much difficulty in making a disposition of claims Nos. 41, 53, and 82. They appear to be proved, but limitations are relied upon by some of the parties, and the envelopes, upon which it is presumed the precise time when they were filed, would appear, have in some way been lost, and it is therefore impossible to fix the period with certainty. A deposition upon the subject, made by N. C. Stephen, Esq., the solicitor having the charge of the claims, has been filed, but this is rather indefinite and unsatisfactory. Under all the circumstances, however, the Chancellor thinks the presumption is, that the claims reached the office in due course of mail, and were filed the day the letter containing them ought to have been received, and the Auditor, in stating the account about to be ordered, will so assume.

ROBERT B. BRINTON, AND OTHERS,
 vs.
 HENRY HOOK, AND OTHERS.

SEPTEMBER TERM, 1850.

[FRAUDULENT CONVEYANCES.]

A CONVEYANCE is void, as against creditors, under the statute of Elizabeth, unless it be made upon a good consideration and *bona fide*.

A voluntary conveyance made by a grantor, not indebted at the time, cannot be impeached by subsequent creditors upon the mere ground of its being voluntary.

But, if such conveyance was made with a fraudulent intent, and with a view to future debts, it may be successfully assailed by subsequent creditors.

A *post nuptial* settlement by the husband upon the wife is good as to subsequent creditors, provided there be no fraudulent intent, and if it be not made with a view to future debts.

A grantor conveyed nearly all his property *in trust*, 1st. For the use of the grantor and his wife during their joint lives, with power to them jointly to dispose of it absolutely; 2d. In case he survived his wife, he was to dispose of it at pleasure; and 3d. Whether he survived her or not, then to